April 4, 1956.

Honorable Louis L. Goldstein President of the Senate State House Annapolis, Maryland

Dear Mr. President:

I am returning herewith, without my signature, Senate Bill No. 148. This Bill is identical with House Bill No. 4, passed during the Special Session of the General Assembly on March 8th, and which is now Chapter 10 of the Acts of 1956.

Therefore, Senate Bill No. 148 is vetoed.

Sincerely,

(s) THEODORE R. McKELDIN,

Governor.

TRMcK/tk

House Bill No. 25—Economic Development

AN ACT to change the title of Article 88C of the Annotated Code of Maryland (1951 Edition), to be "State Planning and Development Commission"; to repeal and re-enact, with amendments, Sections 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of said Article of the Code; Section 2 there-of to be under the new sub-title "Department of Research and Planning"; to add new Section 1A to the said Article and Code, to follow immediately after Section 1 thereof; to repeal Sections 6 and 7 of the said Article and Code, and to enact in lieu thereof new Sections 6, 7 and 7A AND 7B to stand in the place and stead of the sections so repealed and to be under the new sub-title "Department of Economic Development"; reconstituting the State Planning Commission to be the State Planning and Development Commission, with a Department of Research and Planning and a Department of Economic Development, relating to the powers and duties thereof and generally revising and amending the laws relating thereto.

April 4, 1956.

The Honorable John C. Luber Speaker of the House of Delegates State House Annapolis, Maryland

Dear Mr. Speaker:

I am returning unsigned House Bill 25 which was passed by the 1956 Session of the General Assembly for the purpose of expanding the State Planning Commission into two Departments and changing its name to the State Planning and Development Commission.

The bill proposed to establish a Department of Research and Planning which, in the main, would continue the functions presently per-

formed by the Planning Commission.

It would have added the Department of Economic Development.

I am opposed to this expansion for various reasons, any one of which would have sufficed for this veto, and which, I hope will, in